

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/028,787	NIIYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thoi V Duong	2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Thoi V Duong. (3) Tarifur Chowdhury.
 (2) Kirsten A. Grueneberg. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 June 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 5, 7, 15 and 20.


Identification of prior art discussed: Lee et al. (US 6,177,973 B1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding claim rejections 112 2nd paragraph, Applicant will revise claims 5, 15 and 20. Accordingly, the limitation "said metal-oxide layer being in contact with the liquid crystal layer" recited in claim 5 will be deleted and the limitation "wherein said first and said second resin layer are coated on said electrical insulating layer" recited in claims 15 and 20" will be corrected to clarify the display structure of the present invention. Regarding the rejection of claim 1, Applicant will also incorporate claims 9 and 10 into claim 1 to overcome Lee et al. The Examiner will reconsider the claims and do more search upon receiving an official amendment.

Docket No: 217911US0 CIP

Applicant Initiated Interview Request FormApplication No.: 10/028,787 First Named Applicant: Satoshi NIYAMAExaminer: DUONG, Thoi Art Unit: 2871 Status of Application: pending**Tentative Participants:**(1) Kirsten A. Gruenberg (2) _____

(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: June 3, 2004 Proposed Time: 2 pm(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>112, 2nd paragraph</u>	<u>5, 7</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>112, 2nd paragraph</u>	<u>15, 20</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>obviousness</u>	<u>all</u>	<u>all</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**The present invention is not obvious over the combination of the cited references.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)